

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/649,937	08/28/2003	Daniel Shiau	9761-000293/US	6097	
30593 75	590 10/04/2004	EXAMINER		INER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			VU, STEPHEN A		
P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3636	3636	
			DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. •	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Anti-us Communication	10/649,937	SHIAU, DANIEL			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Stephen A Vu	3636			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwithin the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nety filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Au	igust 2003.				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) <u>4</u> is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 August 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		• •			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •				
 Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 	·	ed in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	' ''	d			
	·	-			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/649,937

Art Unit: 3636

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lu (#6,189,908).

Lu shows a bicycle seat assembly comprising a seat frame (112) including a horizontally extending section with front and rear mounting parts, a back cushion (15) having a rear frame mounting side, a front back supporting side, and a seat member (14) mounted on the front mounting part of the horizontally extending section of the seat frame.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu (#6,189,908).

Lu discloses the claimed invention except for the acute angle to be between 12 to 18 degrees and the obtuse angle to be between 102 to 108 degrees. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the seat assembly wherein the acute angle is between 12 to 18 degrees and the obtuse angle is between 102 to 108 degrees, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Galbraith et al, Michels, Gaastra, Ahlberg, and Mabie are cited as showing similar types of bicycle seat assembly.

Application/Control Number: 10/649,937

Art Unit: 3636

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A Vu whose telephone number is 703-308-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M Cuomo can be reached on 703-308-0827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen Vu

September 26, 2004

teshon Vu